

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/970,074	JENSEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alonzo Chambliss	2827	

All Participants:

(1) Alonzo Chambliss.

(2) David R. Fairbairn.

Date of Interview: 16 July 2003

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

N/A

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.


☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: Notice of abandonment is forthcoming.

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 4:10PM



 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: the examiner spoke with Mr. Fairbairn about a response to a restriction requirement mailed on 3/17/03. The attorney informed the examiner that he never received the restriction requirement but would like to elect the product with traverse over the phone. The attorney filed a letter of inquiry on 7/10/03, which was before the date the examiner had a conversation with the attorney but was not scanned into the records of this application until after 7/16/03. However, upon further searching after the conversation with the attorney the examiner records reveal documentation showing that a restriction requirement was mailed for this case on 3/17/03. Therefore, a notice of abandonment is forthcoming.